



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/734,952	12/11/2000	Aravind Sitaraman	CISCO-3294	4939

7590

11/21/2005

David B. Ritchie
Thelen Reid & Priest LLP
P.O. Box 640640
San Jose, CA 95164-0640

EXAMINER

PATEL, ASHOKKUMAR B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

DATE MAILED: 11/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/734,952	Applicant(s) SITARAMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner Ashok B. Patel	Art Unit 2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 August 2005.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 1,10-12,21-23,32-35,44 and 45 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-9,13-20,24-31 and 36-43 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2154

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-45 are subject to examination. Claims 1, 10-12, 21-23, 32-35, 44 and 45 have been cancelled.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 05/05/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the following reasons:

Applicant's argument:

"The Examiner does not provide a specific reference to support the above statements, and support for the statements cannot be found in Lin et al. To the extent the Examiner applies the above statements to the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejections, the Applicants respectfully submit such a rejection is improper, as each and every element as set forth in the claims are not found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Furthermore, to the extent the Examiner applies the same statements to the 35 U.S.C. j 103 rejections, the Applicants assume that the Examiner intended to take Official notice of facts under M.P.E.P. 2144.03 that the rationale supporting the obviousness rejection is based on common knowledge in the art or "well- known" prior art. Under M.P.E.P. 2144.03, "[I]f the applicant traverses such an assertion the examiner should cite a reference in support of his or her position." The Applicants hereby traverse the assertion and request that a reference be cited in support of the position outlined in the Office Action."

Examiner's response:

Art Unit: 2154

Please refer to col. 5, line 37 through col. 6, line 55, Blumer et al. (US 6, 189, 019 B1) for the cited well known prior art and the state of the Internet communications using HTTP message protocol and underlying transmission control protocol/Internet protocol (TCP/IP) data transport protocol of the internet.

The discussion of the state the well known prior art was warranted to show inherency that is built in the reference Lin because of the previously presented argument stating “Since Lin fails to consider GETS, POSTS, or connected subscribers, the reference can not be said to anticipate the current claims. Further, without Lin the other cited references fail to render the current claims obvious.”

In addition Lin, also teaches in col. 2, line 1-6, “FIG. 1 illustrates an aspect of the invention in a broad form. Referring to FIG. 1, a source 102 initiates a session establishment request (e.g., a TCP SYN packet; a new UDP or ICMP packet) to a target 104.”

Examiner would also like to present the reference Srinivas (US 6, 823, 387 B1) to further expand the well known prior art that Lin has inherently disclosed. Please also refer to the Fig.3 and col. 8, line 63 through col. 9, line 9 of the reference Srinivas (US 6, 823, 387 B1) for a TCP SYN packet involving the “legitimate request” wherein “In prior systems, the route information was cached at the time the TCP/IP layer 506 would send the SYN-ACK 514 to the client 500. This route information would form a cache chain with each of these route entries. Of course, if the TCP SYN packet had a spoofed IP address, the caching of the route information for this spoofed client served only to make the route cache

Art Unit: 2154

larger (the chain longer) and more time consuming to processes. To service a legitimate client, the cache chain must be searched to find that client's route information. Thus in order service a legitimate client (subscriber) to determine the "legitimate session requests" the cache chain must be searched to find that client's route information. (receiving a profile for said subscriber).

Claim 2

Applicant's argument:

"The Applicants respectfully disagree. Contrary to the Examiner's statement, Lin et al. does not teach receiving a HTTP request *from a subscriber having an established connection* over a first communication network coupled to at least one other communication network, said request including a Universal Resource Locator (URL). It is noted that the Examiner's statement fails to include the "having an established connection" limitation recited in Claim 2. Additionally, nowhere does Lin et al. refer to a "subscriber" let alone a subscriber having an established connection as recited in Claim 2."

"The Applicants respectfully disagree. The passage cited by the Examiner speaks generally about allowing a number of legitimate session requests to get through to a target. The passage provides no support for the Examiner's conclusion regarding existing sessions. Furthermore, the Examiner's parenthetical reference to a "profile" finds no support in Lin et al."

Examiner's response:

Lin clearly discloses in col. 2, line 15-16, "The filter 106 records the total number of existing sessions and measures the rate of session requests of each

Art Unit: 2154

stream.” Thus Lin include the “having an established connection” limitation recited in Claim 2.

Please refer to the response above for *“from a subscriber having an established connection.”*

Applicant’s Argument:

“Also contrary to the Examiner’s statement, Lin et al. does not teach filtering said request to determine whether said subscriber is authorized to make said request based upon said profile. As discussed above, Lin et al. teaches neither a subscriber having an established connection, nor a profile for the subscriber.”

Examiner’s response:

Please refer to the above responses which evidently explains the teachings of Lin including filtering said request to determine whether said subscriber is authorized to make said request based upon said profile.

Applicant’s argument:

“Also contrary to the Examiner’s statement, Lin et al. does not teach updating a client HTTP request count when said request for said URL is a HTTP GET request or a HTTP POST request. Nowhere does Lin et al. refer to a HTTP GET request or a HTTP POST request. Rather, Lin et al. teaches a session request may be a TCP SYN packet, or a new UDP or ICMP packet.”

Examiner’s response:

Lin clearly discloses in col. 2, line 15-16, “The filter 106 records the total number of existing sessions and measures the rate of session requests of

Art Unit: 2154

each stream.” Thus Lin include the “having an established connection” limitation recited in Claim 2.

And the inherency of Lin including the session request over TCP is evidently presented by Blumer et al. (US 6, 189, 019 B1) in col. 5, line 37 through col. 6, line 55, as well known state of the Internet communications using HTTP message protocol and underlying transmission control protocol/Internet protocol (TCP/IP) data transport protocol of the internet.

Applicant’s argument:

“Thus, Lin et al. cannot be said to teach forwarding said request to said at least one other communication network when said subscriber is authorized to make said request.”

Examiner’s response:

As previously indicated, Lin teaches in col. 2, line 19-21,” A source could be a single host, a group of hosts in a network or domain, or any number of hosts in the entire Internet. By the same token, a target could involve one or more hosts and servers in an internal network. “

Claim 5

Applicant’s argument:

“The Applicants respectfully disagree. Again, Li et al. speaks generally about limiting session establishment packets, but says nothing of HTTP requests. Thus, the identical invention is not shown in Li et al. in as complete detail as is contained in the claim.”

Examiner’s response:

Art Unit: 2154

Please refer to above responses explaining the inherency of Lin including the session request over TCP is evidently presented by Blumer et al. (US 6, 189, 019 B1) in col. 5, line 37 through col. 6, line 55, as well known state of the Internet communications using HTTP message protocol and underlying transmission control protocol/Internet protocol (TCP/IP) data transport protocol of the internet.

Independent Claims 13 and 24 and Dependent Claims 16 and 27

Applicant's argument:

"Claim 13 'is an In re Beauregard claim corresponding to method claim 2. Claim 24 is a means-plus-function claim corresponding to method claim 2. Claim 2 being allowable, Claims 13 and 24 must be allowable for at least the same reasons."

"Claim 16 depends from Claim 13 and is an In re Beauregard claim corresponding to method claim 5. Claim 27 depends from Claim 24 and is a means-plus-function claim corresponding to method claim 5. Claims 13 and 24 being allowable, Claims 16 and 27 must be allowable for at least the same reasons."

Examiner's response:

Please refer to the responses for claims 2 and 5.

Claims 3, 4, 6,7,8 and 9

Applicant's argument:

"The Examiner has not indicated a suggestion or motivation to combine the reference teachings. For this additional reason, no prima facie case of

Art Unit: 2154

obviousness has been established and the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection of Claim 3 should be withdrawn.”

Examiner’s response:

The reference Primeaux teaches the action taken could be defined to suspend the user account or merely mail a message to the system administrator (sending alarm to an Internet Service Provider (ISP) associated with subscriber), warning of a potential intruder including the category of users such as Yes--definitely the appropriate user, No--definitely an intruder and Yes/No--may or may not be the appropriate user. (col. 10, lines 50-59). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine Lin’s capabilities with Primeaux’s usage pattern tracking capabilities and applying the attack preventive measures based on the set threshold levels such as client HTTP request frequency exceeding a maximum HTTP request frequency and setting an alarm to the ISP (the system administrator).

Claims 14-15 and 17-20 and Claims 25-26 and 28-31

Applicant’s argument:

“Claims 14-15 and 17-20 are In re Beauregard claims corresponding to method claims 3-4 and 6-9, respectively. Claims 3-4 and 6-9 being allowable, Claims 14-15 and 17-20 must be allowable for at least the same reasons. Claims 25-26 and 28-31 are means-plus-function claims corresponding to method claims 3-4 and 6-9, respectively. Claims 3-4 and 6-9 being allowable, Claims 25-26 and 28-31 must be allowable for at least the same reasons.”

Examiner’s response:

Art Unit: 2154

Please refer to the response above for claims 3, 4, 6,7,8 and 9.

Claims 36-43**Applicant's argument:**

"The Examiner has not indicated a suggestion or motivation to combine the reference teachings. For this additional reason, no prima facie case of obviousness has been established and the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection of Claim 36 should be withdrawn."

Examiner's response:

The reference Prabandham teaches an authorizer capable of allowing said request said request to be forwarded on at least one other communication network coupled to said first communication network. (Fig. 2, element 216 and col.4, line 67 and col. 5, lines 1-8); a first forwarding interface capable of sending said profile request to an AAA server; (element 212 which has the first receiving interface which is AAA server); a second receiving inter-face capable of accepting a requested profile; and a second forwarding interface capable of forwarding said request on said at least one other communication network. (element 216's interfaces connected to element 212 and element 206). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine Lin with Primeaux's usage pattern tracking capabilities and Prabandham's security protocols. In this way, it will provide an alternative to the Lin's system for an user AAA verification, in addition to filter's capability to selectively passing some of the session establishment requests.

Art Unit: 2154

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless-

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 2, 5, 13, 16, 24 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lin et al. (hereinafter Lin)(US 6,751, 668).

Referring to claim 2,

The reference teaches a method for preventing denial of service attacks (col.1, lines 7-10) against Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP) servers (col.2, lines 17-25) the method comprising:

receiving a HTTP request from a subscriber using a first communication network coupled to at least one other communication network. said request including a Universal Resource Locator (URL), (col.2, lines 21-25)

receiving a profile for said subscriber; filtering said request to determine whether said subscriber is authorized to make said request based upon said profile, (col.2, lines 63-66, col.4, lines 14-18) said filtering including:

updating a client HTTP request count when said request is a HTTP "GET"

Art Unit: 2154

request or a HTTP "POST" request; and applying HTTP server denial of service attack preventative measures when a client HTTP request frequency based on said client HTTP request count exceeds a maximum HTTP request frequency and forwarding said request to said at least one other communication network when said subscriber is authorized to make said request. (col.2, lines 26-62, col.4, lines 14-18).

Referring to claim 5,

The reference teaches the method wherein said applying further comprises dropping the data packet containing said request when said client HTTP request frequency exceeds said maximum HTTP request frequency. (col.2, lines 33-39, lines 63-66).

Referring to claim 13,

Claim 13 is a claim to a program storage device readable by a machine, embodying a program of instructions executable by the machine to perform the steps of method of claim 2. Therefore, claim 13 is rejected for the reasons set forth for the claim 2.

Referring to claim 16,

Claim 16 is a claim to a program storage device readable by a machine, embodying a program of instructions executable by the machine to perform the steps of method of claim 5. Therefore, claim 16 is rejected for the reasons set forth for the claim 5.

Referring to claim 24,

Art Unit: 2154

Claim 24 is a claim to an apparatus carrying out the method of claim 2.

Therefore, claim 24 is rejected for the reasons set forth for the claim 2.

Referring to claim 27,

Claim 27 is a claim to an apparatus carrying out the method of claim 5.

Therefore, claim 27 is rejected for the reasons set forth for the claim 5.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 3, 4, 6, 14, 15, 17-20, 25, 26 and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin et al. (hereinafter Lin)(US 6,751, 668) in view of Primeaux et al. (hereinafter Primeaux) (US 6,334,121).

Referring to claims 3 and 4,

Keeping in mind the teachings of the reference Lin as stated above, the reference fails to teach setting an alarm when said client HTTP request frequency exceeds said maximum HTTP request frequency and sending said alarm to an Internet Service Provider (ISP) associated with subscriber. The reference Primeaux teaches the action taken could be defined to suspend the user account or merely mail a message to the system administrator (sending alarm to an Internet Service Provider (ISP) associated with subscriber), warning of a potential intruder including the category of users such as Yes--definitely the

Art Unit: 2154

appropriate user, No--definitely an intruder and Yes/No--may or may not be the appropriate user. (col. 10, lines 50-59). The reference also teaches that if the usage pattern is outside of the user's normal usage pattern, this triggers the system to react automatically. The reaction of the system is adjustable and will depend primarily on the nature and the degree of destructiveness of a particular command and the level of security awareness that the software is set for (dropping the data packet containing request). Various levels of security are determined by the list of commands deemed critical by the system administrator. (col. 10, lines 60-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine Lin's capabilities with Primeaux's usage pattern tracking capabilities and applying the attack preventive measures based on the set threshold levels such as client HTTP request frequency exceeding a maximum HTTP request frequency and setting an alarm to the ISP (the system administrator).

Referring to claims 6, 7, 8 and 9,

Keeping in mind the teachings of Lin as stated above, although the reference teaches disabling HTTP requests for a hold-down period when said client HTTP request frequency exceeds said maximum HTTP request frequency. (Fig. 4, "shaded area"), the reference fails to teach shutting down the account used to access first communication network when said client HTTP request frequency exceeds said maximum HTTP request frequency and increasing said hold-down period each time said client HTTP request frequency exceeds said maximum HTTP request frequency, and wherein said hold-down period increases

Art Unit: 2154

exponentially each time said client HTTP request frequency exceeds said maximum HTTP request frequency. The reference Primeaux teaches the action taken could be defined to suspend the user account (shutting down the account used to access and disabling HTTP requests for a hold-down period) or merely mail a message to the system administrator, warning of a potential intruder including the category of users such as Yes--definitely the appropriate user, No--definitely an intruder and Yes/No--may or may not be the appropriate user. (col. 10, lines 50-59). The reference also teaches that if the usage pattern is outside of the user's normal usage pattern, this triggers the system to react automatically. The reaction of the system is adjustable and will depend primarily on the nature and the degree of destructiveness of a particular command and the level of security awareness that the software is set for (hold-down period each time client HTTP request frequency exceeds said maximum HTTP request frequency and hold-down period increases exponentially each time client HTTP request frequency exceeds maximum HTTP request frequency). Various levels of security are determined by the list of commands deemed critical by the system administrator. (col. 10, lines 60-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine Lin with Primeaux's usage pattern tracking capabilities based on the normal commands such as a HTTP "GET" request or a HTTP "POST" request; and applying the attack preventive measures based on the set threshold levels such as client HTTP request frequency exceeding a maximum HTTP request frequency set by the security rules and to suspend the user account (shutting

Art Unit: 2154

down the account used to access and disabling HTTP requests for a hold-down period) as desired, based on the level of security awareness that the software is set for (hold-down period each time client HTTP request frequency exceeds said maximum HTTP request frequency and hold-down period increases exponentially each time HTTP frequency exceeds maximum HTTP request frequency) when client HTTP request frequency exceeds a maximum HTTP frequency. This provides a system wherein the system will detect a difference in the pattern of usage. When such a difference is detected, the system will take the appropriate action.

Referring to claims 14 and 15,

Claims 14 and 15 are claims to a program storage device readable by a machine, embodying a program of instructions executable by the machine to perform the steps of method of claims 3 and 4. Therefore, claims 14 and 15 are rejected for the reasons set forth for the claims 3 and 4.

Referring to claims 17, 18, 19 and 20,

Claims 17, 18, 19 and 20 are claims to a program storage device readable by a machine, embodying a program of instructions executable by the machine to perform the steps of method of claims 6, 7, 8 and 9. Therefore, claims 17, 18, 19 and 20 are rejected for the reasons set forth for the claims 6, 7, 8 and 9.

Referring to claims 25 and 26,

Claims 25 and 26 are claims to an apparatus carrying out the method of claims 3 and 4. Therefore, claims 25 and 26 are rejected for the reasons set forth for the claims 3 and 4.

Art Unit: 2154

Referring to claims 28, 29, 30 and 31,

Claims 28, 29, 30 and 31 are claims to an apparatus carrying out the method of claims 6, 7, 8 and 9. Therefore, claims 28, 29, 30 and 31 are rejected for the reasons set forth for the claims 6, 7, 8 and 9.

7. Claims 36-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin et al. (hereinafter Lin)(US 6,751, 668) in view of Primeaux et al. (hereinafter Primeaux) (US 6,334,121). as applied to claims above, and further in view of Prabandham et al. (hereinafter Prabandham)(US 6,701,438).

Referring to claim 36,

The reference Lin teaches a first receiving interface capable of accepting a HTTP request received from a subscriber using a first communication network., said request including a Universal Resource Locator (URL);(Fig. 1, element 106); a profile request generator capable of generating a profile request based upon said request; (col.2, lines 63-66); a filter capable of determining whether said request is authorized based upon said requested profile. said filter including; an updater to update a client HTTP request count when said request for said URL is a HTTP "GET" request or a HTTP "POST" request', and a responder to apply HTTP server denial of service attack preventative measures when a client HTTP request frequency based on said client HTTP request count exceeds a maximum HTTP request frequency; (col.2, lines 26-66, col.4, lines 14-18). Keeping in mind the teachings of the references Lin and Primeaux, both of these references fails to a first forwarding interface capable of sending said profile request to an Authentication, Authorization, and Accounting (AAA) server;

Art Unit: 2154

a second receiving interface capable of accepting a requested profile; an authorizer capable of allowing said request to be forwarding on at least one other communication network coupled to said first communication network; and a second forwarding interface capable of forwarding said request on said at least one other communication network. The reference Prabandham teaches an authorizer capable of allowing said request said request to be forwarded on at least one other communication network coupled to said first communication network. (Fig. 2, element 216 and col.4, line 67 and col. 5, lines 1-8); a first forwarding interface capable of sending said profile request to an AAA server; (element 212 which has the first receiving interface which is AAA server); a second receiving inter-face capable of accepting a requested profile; and a second forwarding interface capable of forwarding said request on said at least one other communication network. (element 216's interfaces connected to element 212 and element 206). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine Lin with Primeaux's usage pattern tracking capabilities and Prabandham's security protocols. In this way, it will provide an alternative to the Lin's system for an user AAA verification, in addition to filter's capability to selectively passing some of the session establishment requests.

Referring to claims 37 and 38,

Claims 37 and 38 are rejected for the reasons set forth for the claims 3 and 4.

Referring to claim 39,

Art Unit: 2154

The reference Lin teaches the method wherein the responder drops the data packet containing said request when said client HTTP request frequency exceeds said maximum HTTP request frequency. (col.2, lines 33-39, lines 63-66).

Referring to claims 40, 41, 42 and 43,

Claims 40, 41, 42 and 43 are rejected for the reasons set forth for the claims 6,7,8 and 9.

Conclusion

Examiner's note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory

Art Unit: 2154

action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ashok B. Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-3972. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A. Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Abp


JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISOR, PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100